

Amendments to the Drawings

Examiner indicates that the drawings are not properly identified in the top margin. In response, Applicant adds “Replacement Sheep” in the top margin of each drawing sheet as suggested by Examiner.

The attached sheets of drawings include Figs. 1-9. These sheets replace the original sheets.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (total of 9 drawing sheets)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 15-27 remain pending. No claim has been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the following remarks.

Rejection of Claims 15-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 15-27 are rejected under 35 USC 103(c) as being unpatentable over Kurth (US Patent Application 2003/0177296) in view of Watts (US Patent Application 2003/0217224), or further in view of Patterson (“Computer Organization and Design, The Hardware/Software Interface, Second Edition”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

The claimed invention as previously presented is patentable over Kurth in view of Watts or further in view Patterson primarily on the reason that the cited prior arts, either alone or in combination (if combinable), fail to establish prima facie case of obviousness based upon the cited prior arts.

Examiner asserts in the Office Action that the element 103 (Fig. 1) or the element 206 (Fig. 2) of Kurth is analogous to the claimed “access request selectors.” Examiner further asserts in the Office Action that the element 304 (Fig. 3) of Watts is analogous to the claimed “ownership selectors.”

According to one aspect of the claimed invention, Claim 15 recites, among others, “ownership selector, coupled to the plurality of access request selectors ... wherein said ownership selector receives outputs of the plurality of access request selectors and arranges the outputs

into a priority queue.” Examiner alleges in the Office Action (paragraph 6) that Watts discloses such feature by indicating that Watts’ paragraph 0032, paragraphs 0054-0055, and elements 502 (Fig. 5) correspond to such disclosure.

After carefully and thoroughly inspecting Watts’ disclosure, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed feature noted above includes two parts: the first part of the noted feature recites that the ownership selector receives outputs of the access request selectors that are coupled thereto; and the second part of the noted feature recites that the ownership selector arranges the outputs into a priority queue.

It is respectfully noted that Watts’ disclosure (that is, paragraph 0032, paragraphs 0054-0055, and elements 502 (Fig. 5)) at best deals with the second part. Examiner, and Watts’ disclosure, is silent with respect to the first part—how the ownership selector receives outputs of the coupled access request selectors. In other words, Examiner fails to address how the Watts’ element 304/504 (=claimed ownership selector) is coupled to the Kurth’s element 206 (=claimed access request selectors), and how the ownership selector receives outputs of the access request selectors.

As no connection or association between Watts and Kurth is found, it is too speculative a leap to conclude without basis on fact that Kurth and Watts, either alone or in combination (if combinable), teach or suggest the claimed feature, particularly the first part of the noted feature as discussed above.

For the foregoing reasons, the cited prior arts, either alone or in combination (if combinable), fail to establish prima facie case of obviousness based upon the cited prior arts.

Another independent Claim 22 is traversed on the same rationale discussed above. With respect to dependent claims not specifically mentioned, it is submitted that these claims are patentable not only by virtue of their dependency on their respective base claims, but also for the totality of features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 15-27 as currently presented are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration is respectfully requested. This paper should be considered as a petition for any necessary Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any extension fees to Deposit Account No. 05-0150.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 22, 2007

/Song Zhu, Reg. No. 44,420/

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
One Maritime Plaza
Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94111
Facsimile (415) 393-9887
Telephone (415) 954-0241
szhu@ssd.com

Song Zhu, Ph.D.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 44,420